

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/179,872	10/28/98	KIM	F 1317.1055/MD

MICHAEL D. STEIN
STAAS & HALSEY
700 ELEVENTH STREET NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON DC 20001

WM21/0827

EXAMINER

BROWN, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	9

DATE MAILED: 08/27/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/179,872

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Brown M. Reuben

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14, 17 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/18/2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On page 2 of applicant's response, applicant correctly points out that claim 1 recites, "displaying, on a TV screen minor channel numbers or programs received through a currently selected major channel". Applicant goes on to assert that neither Ozkan, nor Otsuki discloses displaying minor channels through a currently selected major channel. Examiner, first of all, points out that the combination of Ozkan & Otsuki has been relied upon to provide the instant claimed feature.

While Ozkan does not explicitly detail the GUI presentation utilized to make sub-channel selections from a major channel, such a presentation is **clearly suggested** in the instant reference. A review of Ozkan, at col. 4, lines 15-25 & col. 7, lines 63-67, reveals that sub-picture data including EIT data comprising descriptive lists of programs on sub-channels is transmitted to and received by the user's terminal device. This sub-channel data reads on the claimed minor channels. Without question, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated, and it would have been obvious for one to include a means for actually displaying a list of selectable channels, at least for the very well known advantage of providing the user with a definitive viewing of the available channels.

Furthermore, Ozkan teaches that the sub-channels of programming may represent logical channels or virtual channels, which could also be programming options within a category of programs, see col. 6, lines 23-30. This particular embodiment is especially pertinent since in fact Otsuki specifically discusses and displays a list of programs selectable by a viewer as a result of the viewer previously selecting a particular category; see Fig. 7 & Fig. 8. Thus, for the same motivations as discussed above, it would have been obvious to display the programming option selections for a viewer. Examiner points out that the technology for displaying a list of program selection options for a user was very old in the art at the time the invention was made. Such a feature as presently recited by the applicant, was not patentably distinct at the time the invention was made.

Thus the examiner contends that the combination of Ozkan & Otsuki reads on the claimed feature of displaying minor channel numbers of programs received through a currently selected major channel.

Applicant goes on to discuss features recited in claim 3, such as displaying multiple minor channels after a currently selected major channel number. Again examiner points out that providing users with a visual display of selectable channels, was extremely well known in the art at the time the invention was made and is taught by Otsuki, see Fig. 7 & Fig. 8. Thus Otsuki, in combination with Ozkan reads on the claimed subject matter. Applicant also discusses the rejection of claim 7, examiner maintains the rejection with the above similar arguments. Claim 7

Art Unit: 2611

more specifically calls for selecting an RF channel, which is also disclosed in Ozkan; see col. 6, lines 12-45.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13 & 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozkan, (U.S. Pat # 6,111,611) in view of Otsuki (U.S. Pat # 5,929,932).

Considering claim 1, the claimed method for displaying channel information on a digital TV for receiving digital multichannel TV broadcasting, comprising the steps changing a current channel to a demanded major channel in response to a demand to change a change a major channel is met by the disclosure of Ozkan which teaches that a user selects a desired TV channel by first selecting the major channel, (which represents a bundle of channels), see col. 6, lines 12-25. Ozkan is directed to receiving digital TV over a multichannel transmission protocol, col. 2,

Art Unit: 2611

lines 49-67 & col. 4, lines 24-50. Ozkan teaches that this major channel number may represent a broadcast source, such as the FoxTM network or the RF broadcast channel, i.e. Channel 13.

Furthermore, in Ozkan the major channel number may also represent a particular program characteristic, such as a theme or category, and therefore the viewer may access program channels (i.e. sub-channels or minor channels) according to its category, wherein major channels are represented by the instant category. Moreover, Ozkan discusses that the user selects a secondary channel number, which represents the actual minor channel that the user desires to view, col. 6, lines 29-35.

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding the additional claimed feature of displaying on the TV screen the minor channel numbers of programs received through the currently selected major channel number, even though Ozkan discloses EPG functionality (and teaches that lists of sub-channels are received at the user's terminal, col. 7, lines 65-67 thru col. 8, lines 1-5 & col. 10, lines 41-43), the reference does not explicitly discuss the graphical user interface involved in such a feature. Nevertheless at the time the invention was made, it was well known in the art of EPG to arrange programming channels in a hierarchal manner, according to levels such as categories, themes, virtual or logical channels such that when the user selects a particular first level, then the user is presented with a list of program channels (second level) that corresponds with the instant selected first level. For example Otsuki discloses a graphical user interface wherein the user chooses a particular category or sub-menu, such as Movies, News or Sports and subsequently all of the corresponding programming channels are presented to the user in a list format, (Fig. 7; Fig. 8; col. 7, lines 35-55; col. 8, lines 21-35). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Ozkan with the well known graphical user interface as shown by Otsuki, for the desirable benefit of providing the user with a visual display of potential selectable programming.

Considering claims 2 & 8-9, wherein the minor channels are sequentially arranged in a prescribed manner, Otsuki (Fig. 5; Fig. 8; Fig. 13), discloses the notoriously well known EPG technique of displaying programs in a numerical sequence according to channel number. Otsuki happens to show the list with the channel with the highest number at the bottom of the list, which

reads on the instant claim 9, since there is no recitation requiring that the highest minor channel number is at the top or the bottom of the list.

Considering claim 3, the claimed feature of displaying the minor channels subsequent to the currently selected major channel number reads on the combination of Ozkan (col. 6, lines 25-35) & Otsuki (Fig. 13; col. 11, lines 34-60), wherein after the user selects a category of programming channels, then the corresponding list of programming channels is subsequently displayed for the user.

Considering claim 5, the claimed step of changing a current channel to a demanded minor channel in response to a demand to change a minor channel is met by Ozkan, (col. 6, lines 29-42), when the user selects a sub-channel.

Considering claim 7, the amended claimed method for displaying channel information on a digital TV for receiving digital multichannel TV broadcasting, comprising the steps including selecting an RF channel corresponding to a major channel number selected by a user, reads on the subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1, and is likewise rejected. The amended claimed feature of displaying as a viewing program, a program of a minor channel received through the selected RF channel corresponding to the major channel number selected by the user reads on Otsuki (Fig. 9; col. 8, lines 34-42) which teaches that a viewer may view a currently selected program, for example PROGRAM 2, which is selected from a list of programs. The additional claimed feature of displaying the minor channel numbers received

Art Unit: 2611

through the major channels also reads on the combination of Ozkan & Otsuki, as discussed above in the rejection of claim 1.

Considering claim 10, it would have been obvious to display any one of the channels listed on the EPG, in Fig. 9 of Otsuki.

Considering claims 11 & 13, regarding the claimed feature of changing the viewing program by selecting a corresponding minor channel in response to a channel up or down key, Otsuki discloses in Fig. 9, that a currently selected PROGRAM 2, has it's corresponding broadcast programming displayed within the EPG. Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, it was extremely well known in the art to highlight programs on an EPG list as the user moves the cursor in a particular direction. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan & Otsuki with the well known technique of highlighting (selecting) programs according to the movement of a cursor, for the known benefit of informing the user of the instant location of the cursor. Therefore, in Otsuki it would have been obvious to change the currently viewed program according to the movement of the cursor.

Considering claims 17 & 18, the claimed elements of a apparatus for displaying channel information on a digital TV and elements of a device for displaying channel information on a digital TV corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1, and are

Art Unit: 2611

likewise rejected. Regarding the feature of selecting a major channel which corresponds with a selected RF channel, Ozkan teaches such a feature (col. 6, lines 19-26).

4. Claim 4 & 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozkan & Otsuki as applied to claims 1 & 3 above, and further in view of Youman, (U.S. Pat # 5,629,733).

Considering claims 4 & 6, Ozkan & Otsuki do not discuss hiding any channels or programs as a result of inactivity of the user. However, Youman teaches that as a user navigates through an EPG, a graphic overlay of program information is displayed for the user, (Fig. 5; col. 11, lines 64-67 thru col. 12, lines 1-55). If the user does not make a channel change selection within a predetermined time, the instant graphic overlay is removed. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made, to modify the combination of Ozkan & Otsuki with the technology taught by Youman, at least for the known advantage of reducing the amount of processing power required by the receiver's on-screen display generator, since after a certain amount of time the user would have already viewed the instant relevant information.

5. Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozkan & Otsuki, as applied to claims 8 and 11 above, and further in view of Keenan, (U.S. Pat # 5,161,023).

Considering claim 12, the instant claimed feature reads on an endless loop operation such that once the user gets to the top of a list of programs, the next program to be highlighted (selected), would be the program at the bottom of the list, and vice versa. Keenan (col. 1, lines 51-59) discloses such a technology. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ozkan & Otsuki, with the known technology of 'wrap around' lists as taught by Keenan (Fig. 3A; col. 3, lines 40-52), at least for the desirable purpose of avoiding the user having to move the cursor in the other direction in order to reach the opposite extreme of the instant list, which would be burdensome on the user, at least in the case of long lists of programs.

Considering claim 14, as discussed above in the analysis of claim 12, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Ozkan & Otsuki with the well known 'wrap around' technology disclosed in Keenan (Fig. 3A). However, claim 14 requires the additional step that a user is automatically connected to a succeeding or preceding list of minor channels, depending on whether the user's cursor is currently selecting the highest minor channel or lowest minor channel, respectively of the currently active minor channel list. To that end, Keenan also teaches that a plurality of independent lists of channels may be linked by pointers, which connect the first channel of an instant channel list with the last channel of the next adjacent channel list, and vice versa (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 64-67 thru col. 4, lines 1-25; col. 5, lines 1-15).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2611

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:


(703) 872-9314 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Brown M. Reuben whose telephone number is (703) 305-2399.
The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Andrew I. Faile can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314 for regular
communications and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-
4700.


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600